Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
071326 FEB 19 2008
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

CHI-MING CHOW,
Petitioner

v.

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION,
Respondent

On Petition For Writs Of Certiorari
To The Michigan Supreme Court

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Chi-Ming Chow (pro se)
Petitioner
2580 Holmes Road, Unit 16
Ypsilanti, Michigan
48198-4217
(734) 484-0294

Date: February 7, 2008

FedEx Kinko's · Ann Arbor, MI
1-800-2-KINKOS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Does an attorney have the authority to make false IRA tax law so that the Credit Union can deduct IRA tax from my savings which has already paid tax?

2. Does the Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission have the authority to knowingly neglect IRA tax law to cover up the unlawful attorney's false IRA tax law?

3. Does the Michigan Supreme Court have the authority to knowingly and unmistakenly, conflict with U.S. Constitution's 14th Amendment and turn our constitution's equal justice and equal protection of the laws for all citizens upside down?

4. Does the Attorney Grievance Commission's and the Michigan Supreme Court's violations of the U.S. Constitution's 14th Amendment also violate the U.S. Supreme Court Rule 10 (c)?

5. Should the U.S. Supreme Court grant the Petition For Writ Of Certiorari for a case in which the Attorney Grievance Commission and the Michigan Supreme Court have violated the U.S. Supreme Court Rule 10 (c) and conflicted with relevant decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court?

(Answers will be at the end of the Statement Of The Case. Please see page 11.)

LIST OF PARTIES

PETITIONER: Chi-Ming Chow, a U.S. citizen and now a retired mathematics teacher of Oakland Community College, Michigan.

Address:

Chi-Ming Chow
2580 Holmes Road, No. 16
Ypsilanti, Michigan
48198-4217

Phone: 734-484-0294
Fax: 734-484-0294

RESPONDENT: Attorney Grievance Commission's

Address:

Attorney Grievance Commission's
Marquette Building
243 W. Congress, Suite 256
Detroit, Michigan 48226-3259

Phone: 1-313-961-5819

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

QUESTIONS PRESENTED ..... Page i

LIST OF PARTIES ..... Page ii

INDEX TO APPENDICES..... Page iv

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES..... Page vi

FEDERAL STATUTE ..... Page vii

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI..... Page l

OPINIONS BELOW..... Page 1

JURISDICTION ..... Page 1

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY

PROVISION INVOLVED ..... Page 2

STATEMENT OF THE CASE ..... Page 3

INTRODUCTION OF BACKGROUND ..... Page 3

JUDICIAL DISCRETION..... Page 4

THE MAIN THEME ..... Page 6

ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS PRESENTED

..... Page 11

REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT. ..... Page 12

CONCLUSION.....Page 13

APPENDIXES ....Page 15

INDEX TO APPENDICES

Appendix 1. A copy of 1993 IRS Publication 590 which defines the IRAs tax law. (Please see Appendix Page 1.)

Appendix 2. A copy of IRS Chief B.S. Nadermann's Letter of Nov. 21, 1994 to me which stated: "...Currently, our records do not show that you took a deduction for an IRA on your 1993 return." IRA tar law and IRS Chief's letter have confirmed that I do not have a 1993 IRA. (Please see Appendix Page 2.)

Appendix 3. A copy of Attorney Daniel J. Cramer's letter (fax) of February 1, 2007 to me which stated: "... It is my legal opinion that you established an IRA account, whether or not you took the deduction." He made a false IRA tax law without lawful ground. (Please see Appendix Page 3.)

Appendix 4. A copy of my letter of February 1, 2007 to Attorney Cramer: "You are an attorney. Your legal opinion must agree with the law and obey the law. Please give me the IRA tax law which backs up your statement." Attorney Cramer did not reply because he knew no tax law to back up his false IRA tax law. (Please see Appendix Page 4.)

Appendix 5. Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission's reply of April 10, 2007 denied my complaint.

Appendix 6. On June 18, 2007, I file my complaint at the Michigan Supreme Court for Superintending Control against the Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission for its unjustly backing up of Attorney

Cramer's false IRA tax law. (Please see Appendix Page 5)

Appendix 7. On July 16 2007, Attorney Grievance Commission official, Ms. Wendy, answered, my complaint and lied to the Court that Attorney Cramer responded to my letter of February 1, 2007. She lied because she and Attorney Cramer could not produce such letter. (Please see Appendix Page 6.)

Appendix 8. Michigan Supreme Court's order of September 24, 2007 denied my complaint for Superindenting Control.

Appendix 9. Michigan Supreme Court's orders of November 29, 2007 to deny my Motion for Reconsideration. My complaint was denied without a hearing. Its order essentially denied the IRA tax law and the IRS Chief Nadermann's confirmation that I do not have a 1993 IRA. Moreover, it violates the Constitution of the United States which assures equal justice and equal protections of the laws for all citizens. (Please see Appendix Page 7.)

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

1. The 1991 Case: Rodney King v. Los Angeles City and Police Department. Police officers were convicted and punished by the law for violations of Rodney King's constitutional rights and civil rights to have equal justice and equal protection of the laws. (Please see Page 4 of the Statement.)

This case was reported by national news media and local Detroit News and Ann Arbor News.

2. 1992 Case: United States v. Former FBI Chief Michael Kahoe. (1992). In the case of 1992 fatal shoot-out at a white supremacist's cabin in Ruby Ridge, Idaho, former FBI Chief Michael Kahoe was convicted and punished by the law in 1997 for malicious destruction of evidence, coverup, lying to the court, and obstruction of justice. (Please see Page 4 of the statement.)

This case was reported by national news media and local Detroit News and Ann Arbor News.

3. The 2004 Case: United States v. Martha Stewart. Famous TV Host Martha Stewart became a convict felon for lying to the Federal Court. (Please see page 5 of the Statement.)

This case was reported by national news media and local Detroit News and Ann Arbor News.

Federal Statute:

1. U.S. Constitution, 14th Amendment:

Equal justice and equal protection of the laws for all citizens born or naturalized in the United States. (Please see Page 2 of the Statement.)

2. U.S. Supreme Court Rule. 10 (c): The Court considers Writ of Certiorari if a state court has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with relevant decisions of this Court.

(Please, see Page 13 of the Statement.)

PETITION FOR WRITS OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner, Chi-Ming Chow, respectively request that this Court Issue a writ of certiorari to review the Michigan Supreme Court's order of November 29, 2007 to deny my complaints for Superintending Control against Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission which allowed Attorney Cramer to lie and make false IRA tax law without being punished by our laws and professional disciplines.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinions and order of the Michigan Supreme Court appear in Appendix 7 to this petition as Chi-Ming Chow v. Attorney Grievance Commission, SC: 134207 and AGC: 0707/07 dated November 29, 2007

(Note: It unjustly denied my complaint to back up Attorney Grievance Commission which allowed Attorney Cramer to make false IRA tax law.)

JURISDICTION

Pursuant to the U.S. Supreme Court Rule 10, especially, Rule 10 (c), this Court has jurisdiction because Michigan Supreme Court's orders have conflicted with relevant decision of this Court to support and protect the Constitution of the United States which assures equal justice and equal protection of the laws for all citizens.

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

U.S. Constitution Amendment 14, Section 1:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

The act conducted by Michigan Supreme Court to allow Attorney Grievance Commission to cover up Attorney Cramer's lies and false IRA tax law to harm his client and please the wrongful other side has turned our constitution and law of equal justice upside down. This is clearly conflicting with the U.S. Constitution's 14th Amendment which is decisively supported by this Court.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Dear Honorable U.S. Supreme Court Judges Roberts, Stevens, Scalia, Kennedy, Souter, Thomas, Ginsburg, Breyer, Alito:

INTRODUCTION OF BACKGROUND

I am a retired charter mathematics teacher of Oakland Community College in Michigan. I have retired since 1992 after teaching for more than 26 years.

I am not an attorney. With your friendly and enthusiastic Court officials' assistance and supplies of court rules and sample copy, I am now able to file this petition for a writ of certiorari by myself. I shall write my statement based only on evidences, facts and the laws. Facts is better than fluent argument. I sincerely hope that this Court will get the justice served and recover the damage to our constitution and law of equal justice.

I am filing a petition for writs of certiorari regarding Michigan Supreme Court's unjust denial of my complaint for Superintending Control against Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission without a hearing. Attorney Grievance Commission allowed Attorney Daniel J. Cramer to make false IRA tax law so that my Credit Union can charge IRA tax on my savings which has already paid tax. Making and covering up false tax law are denying the U.S. tax law. It has also violated my constitutional rights to have equal justice and equal protection of the laws.

JUDICIAL DISCRETION

In order to avoid any racial prejudice and discrimination, I would also like to first make the following point clear for my petition.

The U.S. Supreme Court Rule 10 states that Review on a writ of certiorari is not a matter of right, but of judicial discretion.

Based on any law dictionary, judicial discretion is not a dictatorship. It is a judicial official's freedom to make choices within the limit of his/her authority based on honesty, fairness and the obedience of the law.

This assertion of the discretion is very important for the Court where people of different races, religions, sexes, etc. are looking for justice.

In the 1991 Rodney King v. Los Angeles City case, Police officers severely beat Rodney King when they subdued him. They were convicted and punished by the law for violating Rodney King's constitutional rights and civil rights.

In the 1992 United States v. Former FBI Chief Michael Kahoe case, a fatal shoot-out incident occurred at a white supremacist's cabin in Ruby Ridge, Idaho. Former FBI Chief Michael Kahoe was convicted and punished by the law in 1997 for malicious destruction of evidence, cover up and obstruction of justice when he investigated this case.

The 2004 case: United States v. Martha Stewart. Famous TV Host Martha Stewart became a convict felon for lying to the Federal Court.

These are examples and precedents that in front of the law, all people are equal. Unlawful government officials have no immunity of the law. We must not allow unjust Attorney Grievance Commission officials and Court Judges to abuse their authority, judicial discretion and the law. Abusing the authority, discretion and law dishonestly and unfairly is a violation of the law of justice.

THE MAIN THEME

Please now allow me to state my Petition for Writs for Certiorari as follows:

In 1993, I sent a $2000.00 check to my Credit Union to open an IRA. When I reported my 1993 federal income tax return, I noticed that I could only. use my earned money to open an IRA. Since I was retired and not working, I was not qualified to have an IRA. So I did not deduct the $2000.00 IRA amount from my 1993 federal income tax return and owed no IRA tax.

I also immediately asked my Credit Union to change the $2000.00 deposit to a saving account. However, my Credit Union insists that I have a 1993 TRA.

Note: The 1993 IRS Publication 390 defines the IRAs tax law as follows:

"An individual retirement arrangement (IRA) is a personal savings plan that offers you tax advantages to set aside money for your retirement. That means that you may be able to deduct your contributions to your IRA in whole or in part, depending on your circumstances, and that, generally, amounts in your IRA, including earnings and gains, are not taxed until distribute to you."

This is the IRA tax law which can not be denied. (Please see Appendix 1.)

On Nov. 21, 1994, IRS Chief, B.S. Nadermann wrote me a letter which stated: "...Currently our records do not show that you took a deduction for an IRA on your 1993 return..." (Please see Appendix 2.)

RA tax law and IRS Chief's letter have confirmed that I do not have a 1993 IRA. However, my Credit Union still unreasonably and unfriendly insists that I have a 1993 IRA. Its claim is obviously false and against the fact that I do not have a 1993 IRA. It refuses to change this non-existent IRA to my savings account. It even deducts IRA tax from the non-existent IRA, my savings account, which has already paid tax. This is very unfair and unjust. This is the essence of this case. It is so simple and clear.

In the year of 2002 when my age reached 71½, my Credit Union started to deduct the minimum IRA distribution from my true IRA. It did not touched my non-existent IRA until May of 2005. In May of 2005, instead of deduct the minimum IRA distribution from my true IRA, it deducted the minimum IRA distribution from the non-existent IRA, my savings account, for both of my true IRA and non-existent IRA. It tried to eliminate the non-existent IRA evidence fast. Eliminating evidence to cover up the fact is against the law. Moreover, as I have stated above, my Credit Union is unlawfully deducting the IRA minimum distribution tax from my savings account, which has already paid the tax. This is very unfair, unjust and against the tax law.

This is why on June 1, 2006, I retained Attorney Daniel J. Cramer, a tax attorney, to correct my Credit Union's unlawful wrong doings. At first, he agreed with me because he knew the tax law. However, after his contacts with my Credit Union, his racial prejudice changed his mind and tried unlawfully to help my Credit Union and double-cross his own client. On February 1, 2007, he faxed his letter to me and stated: ".... It is my legal opinion that you established an IRA account, whether or not you took the deduction,....." (Please see Appendix 3.)

After receiving Attorney Cramer's fax of February 1, 2007, on the same day, February 1, 2007, I sent Attorney Cramer a fax and stated: "You are an attorney. Your legal opinion must agree with the law and obey the law. Please give me the IRA tax law which backs up. Statement If you can not find such law, you may be making your own false IRA tax law to cheat and harm your client and assist the wrongful other side. This will be seriously violating the law and unethical. For your honesty and reputation, please reply this letter soon." (Please see appendix 4.)

Attorney Cramer has never replied my letter of February 1, 2007. He knows he has made a false IRA tax law and there is no tax law to back up his false tax law.

Since Attorney Cramer did not respond my letter of February 1, 2007, so on March 5, 2007, based on Michigan Court Rule 9.104, the Ground for Discipline, I filed my complaint against him at the Attorney Grievance Commission. It is a complaint for his violations of professional standards such as making false statement, injustice, un-ethics, dishonesty, immoral, etc. My grievance is based on law and facts. It is full of merits.

On April 10, 2007, Attorney Grievance Commission Senior Associate Counsel Stephen P. Vella unjustly denied my grievance for my allegations of misconduct are without merit. He has completely neglected the law and all the facts I have stated above.

On June 18, 2007, I filed my complaint at the Michigan Supreme Court for Superintending Control against the Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission based on the law arid the facts. (Please see Appendix 5.)

On July 16, 2007, Attorney Grievance Commission Senior Associate Counsel Wendy A. Neeley responded my complaint. She untruthfully stated that my complaint has no merits and denied all the law and facts I have stated before. Moreover, on Page 2, line 11 of her Argument it states:" "Additionally, as evidenced by the attachments to Plaintiff's complaint for Superintending Control, Cramer responded to his February 1, 2007 letter." This statement is completely false. It is a lie in front of the Court. (Please see Appendix 6.)

It is a false statement because by my request, Ms. Neeley and Attorney Cramer were unable to produce a copy of Attorney Cramer's response to my letter of February 1, 2007 to the Court. There is no tax law to back up Attorney Cramer's false IRA tax law. This fact confirms that she has lied to the Court.

On November 29, 2007, Michigan Supreme Court unjustly denied my complaint without a hearing. (Please see Appendix 7.)

The Attorney Grievance Commission and the Michigan Supreme Court have neglected all the IRA tax law and IRS Chief Nadermann's letter which have confirmed that I do not have a 1.993 IRA. Instead, they unjustly allowed Attorney Grievance Commission official Neeley to lie to back up Attorney Cramer's false IRA tax law. Michigan. Supreme Court has denied IRA tax law of the United States. This is a cover-up and obstruction of justice. Moreover, it has also violated my constitutional rights to have equal justice and equal protection of the laws.

Thus, in order to get the justice served, I have no alternative other than filing my petition for writ of certiorari at the Supreme Court of the United States.

Now based, on the above-mention evidences and facts in my Statement, it is clear that the answers for Questions Presented at the beginning of this petition are as follows:

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. No. An attorney does not have the authority to make false IRA tax law to let the Credit Union to deduct IRA tax from my savings account which has already paid tax.

2. No. The Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission does not have the authority to knowingly neglect IRA tax law to cover up the unlawful attorney's false IRA tax law because it is against the law.

3. No. The Michigan Supreme Court does not have the authority to knowingly and unmistakenly conflict with U.S. Constitution's 14th Amendment and turn our constitution's equal justice and equal protection of the laws for all citizens upside down because it is against the Constitution of the United States.

4. Yes. The Attorney Grievance Commission's and the Michigan Supreme Court's violations of the U.S. Constitution's 14th Amendment also violates the U.S. Supreme Court Rule 10 (c).

5. Yes. The U.S. Supreme Court should grant the Petition For Writ Of Certiorari for my case in which the Attorney Grievance Commission and the Michigan Supreme Court has violated the U.S. Supreme Court Rule 10 (c) and conflicted with relevant decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court to support the Constitution of the United States.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION FOR WRIT

1. This case will be a unique case in the U.S. Judicial historical record because it is regarding the Michigan Supreme Court Judges' abuse of their authorities and their denials of the U.S. tax law and U.S. Constitution's 14th Amendment. If my petition for writ of certiorari is denied, then the tax law of the United States and the Constitution of the United States are also denied. Without the law and Constitution of the United States, there will no justice. It will be a disgrace to our country. This is why this court should grant my petition for writ.

2. My complaint is based on the U.S. IRA tax law which is undeniable. There is no confusion or ambiguity for this Court to decide which side it should believe. There is only one choice that this Court must take, that is to obey the law. This is why my petition for writ should be granted.

3. The Constitution of the United States is the foundation on which our country is built. It assures equal justice and equal protection of the laws for all citizens born or naturalized in the United States. I am a U.S. citizen and my constitutional rights have been violated as I have stated above. This unusual and serious nature of my case has compelling reason for this Court to consider and grant my petition for a writ of certiorari.

4. The Attorney Grievance Commission's and Michigan Supreme Court's violations of the U.S. Constitution's 14th Amendment in my case have also violated the U.S. Supreme Court Rule 10 (c) and conflicted with relevant decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. Therefore this Court should grant my Petition For Writ Of Certiorari.

Conclusion

1. Because of the clearness and simplicity of my case, it shows that the lower Court Judges have deliberately abused their authority to cover up the Attorney Grievance Commission officials' lies and the unlawful attorney's false IRA tax law. Their injustice makes me a victim that I am now paying IRA tax for my savings which has already paid the tax. Consequently, they have also violated my constitutional rights to have equal justice an equal protection of the laws.

Would any of your Honors let the false IRA tax law charge the IRA tax on your savings which has already paid tax? Of course not.

This Court is the highest law authority in this country. Your Honors has the duty to correct the lower Court's misjudgment by granting my petition for writ of certiorari.

2. In front of the law, all people are equal. No one is above the law. We must not allow the lower Court Judges to abuse their authority. Granting my Petition for Writ of Certiorari will remind them this solemn fact.

3. Also, because of the clearness and simplicity of my case, there is no doubt that the Attorney Grievance Commission and the lower Court Judges' motive of injustice is cause by their racial prejudice. Consequently, they have violated the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and conflicted with U.S. Court Rule 10 (c) which supports the U.S. Constitution. This is why this Court should grant my petition for writ.

4. In my case, the Attorney Grievance Commission and the lower Court Judges protect the law violators to harm the victim. They have turned our constitution and law of equal justice upside down. I hope your Honors will reprehend them and tell them that they are unfaithful to our constitution. They have made America the Beautiful ugly. This Court's granting my petition for writ of certiorari will wake up their consciences so that they will regret and enforce the law without bias. This will be good for our country.

Finally, your Honors' justice and granting my Petition For Writ Of Certiorari will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

"s/"

(Signed on original 6-1/8" by 9¼" paper)

Ching-Ming Chow.
2580 Holmes Road, Unit 16
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48198-4217
(734-484-0294. Fax: (same))
Dated: February 7, 2008

INDEX TO APPENDICES

Appendix 1. A copy of 1993 IRS Publication 590 which defines the IRAs tax law ..... Appendix Page 1.

Appendix 2. A copy of IRS Chief B.S. Nadermann's Letter of Nov. 21, 1994 to me. This letter an IRA tax law have confirmed that I do not have a 1993 IRA ..... Appendix Page 2.

Appendix 3. A copy of Attorney Daniel J. Cramer's fax of February 1, 2007 to me which made the false IRA tax law..... Appendix Page 3.

Appendix 4. A copy of my letter of February 1, 2007 to Attorney Cramer asking him to show the tax law which backs up his false IRA tax law. He could reply ..... Appendix Page 4.

Appendix 5. Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission's reply of April 10, 2007 denied my complaint.....Appendix Page 5.

Appendix 6. On June 18, 2007, I file my complaint at the Michigan Supreme Court for Superintending Control against the Michigan Attorney Grievance Commission for its unjustly backing up of Attorney Cramer's false IRA tax law..... .....Appendix Page 6.

Appendix 7. On July 16, 2007, Attorney Grievance Commission official, Ms. Wendy, lied to the Court that Attorney Cramer responded to my letter of February 1, 2007. She lied because she and Attorney Cramer could not produce such letter....Appendix Page 7.

Appendix 8. Michigan Supreme Court's order of September 24, 2007 denied my complaint for Superindenting Control.....Appendix Page 8.

Appendix 9. Michigan Supreme Court's orders of November 29, 2007 unjustly denies my Motion for Reconsideration. My complaint was denied without a hearing.....Appendix Page 9.

Appendix 1

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Publication 590
Cat. No. 15160x

Individual Retirement Arrangements (IRAs)

For use in preparing 1993 returns

Contents:

Important changes 2

Important Reminders 2

Introduction 2

Chapter 1 – Overview 3

(Appendix 1 continued.)

OVERVIEW

This chapter contains a brief overview of the rules that apply to IRAs. You will find the detailed coverage of the rules in the Chapters that follow.

An individual retirement arrangement (IRA) is a personal savings plan that offers you tax advantages to set aside money for your retirement. That means that you may be able to deduct your contributions to your IRA in whole or in part, depending on your circumstances, and that, generally, amounts in your IRA, including earnings and gains, are not taxed until distribute to you.

(Note: This is the IRA tax law which can not be denied.)

Appendix 2

Department of Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Cincinnati, Ohio 45999

In reply refer to: 1760605974
Nov. 21, 1994 ITR 387C
xxxxxx600 9312 30 000

01561

CHI-MING CHOW
PO BOX 903
NOVI, Michigan 48376-0903037

Taxpayer Identification Number xxxxxx600
Tax Period(s) Dec. 31, 1993

Form: 1040

Dear Taxpayer:

Thank you for your inquiry dated Sep. 20, 1994.

Currently our records do not show that you took a deduction for an IRA on your 1993 return. You may contact your school with this information. We are not allowed by law to disclose information about taxpayer account without the proper authorization. Forms for this are enclosed.

If you have any questions about this letter, please write us the address shown on this letter. If you prefer, you may call the IRS telephone number list in your local directory. An employee there may be able to help you, but office at the address shown on this letter is most familiar to your case.

(Appendix 2 continued.)

Whenever you write, please include your telephone number, the hours you can be reached, and this letter. You may also want to keep a copy of this letter for your record.

Your telephone number ( ) _____
Hours_____

We apologize for any inconvenience we may have cause you.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

"s/"

_____
B.S. Nadermann
Chief, Technical Assistance Section

Enclosure (s):
Copy of this letter
Envelope
Form 2848

Appendix 3

Law Offices
Cramer & Minock, PLC
339 East Liberty Street, Suite 200
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

Telephone: 734-668-2200
FAX: 734-668-0416

VIA FACSIMILE
734-484-0294
Chi-Ming Chow
P.O. Box 903
Novi, Michigan 48376-0903

Re: Michigan Credit Union

Dear Mr. Chow:

In response to your letter of your letter at January 30, 2007, based on your allegation, regarding my representation of you, I must terminate our attorney-client relationships. Accordingly, I will no longer represent you.

In connection of the two questions set forth in your letter, please be advised that Mr. Gates indicated to me that he would has his office re-examine the issues you raised. His office did so and advised me in writing of the results of their investigation and they intended to take no action other than you may direct in connection with IRA account using procedures consistent with IRS regulations. A copy of this report has been provided to you.

(Appendix 3 continued.)

In connection with your second question, it is my legal opinion that you established an IRA account, whether or not you took the deduction, and that you failed to timely correct the deposit into IRA account using the forms provided to you by the credit un-ion. My legal opinion has been expressed in prior correspondence and remains unchanged. It is my opinion that you must now follow the procedures required by the credit union to withdraw the funds and then provide an explanation to the IRS regarding the mistake made in establishing the account and request that penalty be assessed on this transaction. As I previously stated, any claim you may have for damages may be pursued against the credit union by you through other counsel should you chose to do so.

It is unfortunate that my efforts to assist you has been unsatisfactory in your view. However, at this point you must seek other counsel if you wish to further pursue this matter.

Very truly yours,

CRAMER & MINOCK, P.L.C.

"s/"

Daniel J. Cramer

Appendix 4

Chi-Ming Chow (Mr.)
P.O. Box 903
Novi, Michigan 48376-0903
(734-484-0294 Fax same))

Attorney Daniel J. Cramer
339 S. Liberty St., Ste. 200
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
(734-668-2200 Fax 734-668-0416)

February 1, 2007
Dear Attorney Cramer:

The following statement is a response to your fax of February 1, 2007 to my inquiry of January 30, 2007 to you. (Please see attached copy.)

1. Based on your fee record of 6/1/2006,
Conference with client, Review document,
I have made it very clear to you:

1) According to IRA tax law, when one is working, one's income is high. So one can deduct part of one's income to one's IRA. The deducted IRA amount will not pay high taxed. After one is retired, one's income is low. One can then distribute one's IRA and pay lower tax on IRA.

2) In IRS Chief B.S. Nadermaan's letter of Nov. 21, 1994 to me, it states: "...Currently our records do not show that you took a deduction for an IRA on your 1993 return....."

(Appendix 4 continued.)

Thus, by IRA tax law, I do not have a 1993 Excess IRA or IRA and owe no IRA tax because I did not deduct the $2,000.00 IRA contribution from my 1993 IRA tax return. It will be against the IRA tax law to ask me to pay tax on nonexistent Excess IRA or IRA distribution.

Now your fax of February 1, 2007 states: "it is my legal opinion that you established an IRA account whether or not you took the deduction."

You are an attorney. Your legal opinion must agree with the law and obey the law. Please give me the IRA tax law which backs up your statement. If you can not find such law, you maybe making your own false law to cheat your client and assist the other side to harm your own client. This will be seriously violating the law and unethical.

For your honesty and reputation, please reply this letter soon.

Sincerely,

"s/"

Chi-Ming Chow

STATE OF MICHIGAN

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE
COMMISSION

KAREN QUINLAN VALVO
CHAIRPERSON
MICHAEL MURRAY
VICE-CHAIRPERSON
BARBARA B. GATTORN
SECRETARY

MEMBERS
RICHARD B. POLING, JR.
RUSSELLE E. MOHNEY, M.D.
NOELLE A. CLARK
KENT J. VANA
KAREN M. DUNNE WOODSIDE
MARTHA D. MOORE

ROBERT L. AGACINSKI
GRIEVANCE ADMINISTRATOR
ROBERT E. EDICK
DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR
CYNTHIA C. BULLINGTON
ASSISTANCE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR

ASSOCIATE COUNSEL
WENDY A. NEELEY
RUTHANN STEVENS
STEPHEN P. VELLA
PATRICK K. McGLINN
FRANCES A. ROSINSKI
EMILY A. DOWNEY
KIMBERLY L. UHURU
NANCY R. ALBERTS
DINA P. DAJANI
RHONDA SPENCER POZEHL
JAMES W. METZ
NANCY J. WESTVELD

MARQUETTE BUILDING
243 W. CONGRESS, SUITE 256
DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48226-3259
TELEPHONE (313) 961-6585
FAX (313) 961-5819
WWW.AGCMI.COM

April 10, 2007

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL
Chi-Ming Chow
2580 Holmes, #16
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48198

RE: Chi-Ming Chow as to Daniel J. Cramer
AGC File No. 0707/07

Dear Mr. Chow:

This office received your Request for Investigation, however, the allegations in your complaint are insufficient to warrant review by the Commission. Accordingly, after careful review by the staff, this matter is being closed under the authority of the Grievance Administrator pursuant to Michigan Court Rule 9.112(C)(1)(a).

Your disagreement with the opinion of Attorney Cramer is not grounds for a Request for Investigation.

Mr. Cramer has been provided with a copy of your Request for investigation.

If my staff or I can be of service to you in the future, please do not hesitate to contact us again.

Very truly yours,

Stephen P. Vella
Senior Associate Counsel
"s/"

SPV/bat
Cc: Daniel J. Cramer
(With Enclosures)

Appendix 6

Chi-Ming Chow (Mr.)
2580 Holmes Road, No. 16
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48198-4217
(734-484-0294 Fax (same))

Or P.O. Box 903, Novi, Michigan 48376
(My tax address)

Court Clerk Corbin R. Davis
Michigan Supreme Court
P.O. Box 30052
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7552

June 18, 2007

Dear Court Clerk Davis:

This is a complaint for Superintending Control against Attorney Grievance Commission dated June 18, 2007. It is regarding an unreasonable decision made by the Attorney Grievance Commission Senior Associate Counsel Stephen P. Vella not to initiate disciplinary proceedings.

Enclosed please find the following items:

1. An original and seven copies of my "Complaint for Superintending Control".

2. A notarized affidavit to indicate that I have mailed one complete true copy of my "Complaint for Superintending Control" to Grievance Administrator Robert L. Agacinski and one complete true copy of my "Complaint for Superintending Control" to Attorney Daniel J. Cramer. One copy is for myself.

(Please see Notary Public below.)

(Appendix 6 continued.)

3. A $375.00 entry fee payable to the State of Michigan.

Your investigation and justice for all will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

"s/" _____.

Ching-Ming Chow

Subscribed and sworn before me, this 18th day of June 2007, a Notary Public in and for Washtenaw County, Michigan.

"s/" _____.

(Signature)

Heon J. Kim

NOTARY PUBLIC

My commission expires 10/07/2010

Appendix 7

STATE OF MICHIGAN
ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION

Marquette Building
243 W. Congress, Suite 256
Detroit, Michigan 48226-3259
Telephone (313) 961-5819
www.agcmi.com

Karen Q. Valvo
Chairperson
Michael Murray
Vice-Chairperson
Barbarab Gottorn
Secretary

Members
Ric. B. Poling, Jr.
R. E. Mohney, M.D.
Noeel. A. Clark
Kent J. Vana
K. M. D. Woodside
Martha D. Moore

Robert L. Agacinski
Grievance Administ.
Roberte Edick
Deputy Administrator
Cynthia C. Bullington
Asst. Deputy Ad.

Associate Counsel
Wendy A. Neeley
Ruthann Stevens
Stephen P. Vella
Patrick K. McGlinn
Fran. A. Rosinski
Emily A. Downey
Kimb. L. Uhuru
Nancy R. Alberts
Dina P. Dajani
Rhon. S. Pozehl
James W. Metz
Nancy J. Westveld

July 16, 2007 Via Federal Express

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Corbin R. Davis, Clerk of the Court
Michigan Supreme Court
925 W. Ottawa, 4th Floor, P.O. Box 30052
Lansing, Michigan 48915

(Appendix 7 continued.)

RE: Supreme Court Case No. 134207
AGC File No. 0707/07

Dear Mr. Davis:

Enclosed for fling please find the original and eight copies of an answer to Complaint for Superintending control and Brief in Support, together with Proof of Service relative to the above-entitled matter.

Please be advised that the enclosed material involve investigations that were confidential under MCR 9.126. Consequently, it is requested these files be kept confidential and protected pursuant to MCR 9.129.

Very truly yours,

"s/"

Wendy A. Neeley
Senior Associate Counsel

WAN/cjv
Enclosures
c.c.: Chi-Ming Chow, Plaintiff
Daniel J. Cramer, Esq.

(Appendix 7 continued.)

ARGUMENT

The Grievance Administrator Did Not Abuse his Discretion in Dismissing Plaintiff's Request For Investigation

To justify a complaint for superintending control under MCR 9.122 (A) (2) and MCR 7.304 (A), Plaintiff must establish that the Grievance Administrator abused his decision when he dismissed his Request for investigation pursuant to MCR (C) (1) (a). Meyer v Attorney Grievance Commission 406 Mich 1124 (1979), Leitman v State Bar Grievance Board, 387 Mich 596, 606 (1972). No such showing has been made by Plaintiff.

In his Request for Investigation, AGC File No.0707/07, Plaintiff alleged that Attorney Cramer gave him an erroneous legal opinion regarding his dispute with his credit union over his 1993 IRA account and failed to respond to Plaintiff's February 1, 2007 letter requesting additional information regarding his legal opinion. Plaintiff was advised that his disagreement with Attorney Cramer's opinion was insufficient ground for further investigation by the Attorney Grievance Commission. Additionally, as evidence by the attachment to plaintiff's Complaint for Superintending Control, Attorney Cramer responded to his February 1, 2007 letter.

(Note: This underline marked statement is a lie to the Court because in my Rebuttal of July 21, 2007 to

(Appendix 7 continued)

Attorney Grievance Commission's Answer to my complaint for Superintending Control, I requested Senior Associate Counsel Neeley and Attorney Cramer to produce Attorney Cramer's responding letter to my February 1, 2007 letter, to him. They were unable and could not produce such responding letter. There is no tax law to back up Attorney Cramer's self-made false IRA tax law.)

Order

Michigan Supreme Court
Lansing, Michigan

Clifford W. Taylor
Chief Justice

Michael F. Cavanagh
Elizabeth A. Weaver
Marilyn Kelly
Maura D. Corrigan
Robert P. Young, Jr.
Stephen J. Markman
Justices

September 24, 2007

134207

CHI-MING CHOW,
Plaintiff,

v

SC: 134207
AGC: 0707/07

ATTORNEY GRIEVANCE COMMISSION,
Defendant.

_____/

On the order of the Court, the complaint for superintending control is considered, and relief is DENIED, because the Court is not persuaded that it should grant the requested relief.

I, Corbin R. Davis, Clerk of the Michigan Supreme Court, certify that the foregoing is a true and complete copy of the order entered at the direction of the court.

September 24, 2007 "s/" _____
Clerk

Michigan Supreme Court
Lansing, Michigan

Clifford W. Taylor
Chief Justice

Michael F. Cavanagh
Elizabeth A. weaver
Marilyn Kelly
Maura D Corrigan
Robert P. Young, Jr.
Stephen J. Markman
Justice

ORDER

November 29, 2007

134207 (8)

CHI-MING CHOW,
Plaintiff,

v

SC: 134207
AGC: 0707/07

Attorney Grievance Commission,
Defendant

On order of the Court, the motion for reconsideration of this Court's September 24, 2007 order is considered, and it is DENIED, because it does not appear that the order was entered erroneously.

(Appendix 9 continued)

I, Corbin R. Davis, Clerk of the Michigan Supreme Court, certify that the foregoing is a true and complete copy of the order entered at the direction of the Court.

November 19, 2007

_____ "s/"_____

Clerk

SEAL OF THE MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT
LANSING P1119

(Note: Michigan Supreme Court's order of November 29, 2007 to deny my Motion for Reconsideration is unjust and against the law. Its order essentially denies the IRA tax law and the IRS Chief Nadermann's confirmation that I do not have a 1993 IRA. It backs up the unjust Attorney Grievance Commission to allowed my Credit Union to use my attorney's self-made false IRA tax law to deduct the IRA tax from the non-existent 1993 IRA, my savings, which has already paid tax. This is very unfair and unjust. Moreover, it violates the Constitution of the United States which assures equal justice and equal protections of the laws for all citizens.)

END